APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/786,313	02/25/2004	Ravipal S. Soin	MSFT-3501/300585.03	3447

23377   7590   03/17/2009
WOODCOCK WASHBURN LLP
CIRA CENTRE, 12TH FLOOR
2929 ARCH STREET
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19104-2891

EXAMINER
RECEK, JASON D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2442	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
03/17/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _____ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS,
WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This is in response to the amendment filed on 29 January 2009.

Status of Claims

Claims 1, 3-17 and 19-56 are pending.

Claims 1, 3-17 and 19-32 are allowable.

Claims 33-56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Response to Arguments

1.   Applicant's arguments, see pg. 13-16 with respect to the 101 rejections have been fully considered and are persuasive. The 101 rejection of claims 44-48 has been withdrawn.

2.   Applicant's arguments, see pg. 16-18 with respect to the 103 rejection of claims 1, 3-17 and 19-32 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Specifically, the argument that the generation of a ticket containing information on how to connect and the selection of a projection mode is not taught by the prior art is persuasive. The rejection of these claims has been withdrawn.

3.   Applicant's arguments with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 33-56 under
103(a) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has
been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is
made in view of Salonidis et al. US 2003/0096576 A1.

Allowable Subject Matter

4.   The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject
matter: independent claims 1 and 19 recite "generating in the sender device, a ticket
that provides information on a) how to connect to the sender device and b) which one
amongst a plurality of projection modes is to be used" and "sending the ticket from the
sender device to the at lest one alternate display device". These limitations are novel
and non-obvious in view of the prior art. The prior art teaches wireless presentation
systems including the use of UPnP and remoting protocols. However the art does not
teach or suggest the above recited limitations. Dependent claims 3-18 and 20-32 are
allowable based on their dependency.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all
obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

1.   Claims 33 – 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Zhang in view of Masumoto, Parsons Jr., Acharya and in further view of Salonidis et al.

US 2003/0096576 A1.

        Regarding claim 33, Zhang discloses "a server" as a server (pg. 460 section 3),

"a user interface" as a user interface (pg. 463 section 4.4), and "a transmitter" as all

computing devices are in wireless communication so they must include a transmitter

(pg. 463 section 5, Fig. 6). Zhang does not disclose "public content and private content"

nor "only the public content is rendered" however this is taught by Masumoto as having

public and private content and only displaying the public content (col. 5 ln. 15-19, Fig.

5).

        Zhang does not disclose "establishing a remote session, via a remoting protocol,

between the server computing device and the at least one client display device"

however this is suggested by Masumoto as the computer and display device are

connected on a wireless network (Masumoto col. 16 ln. 8) which would necessary use

some protocol. Applicant has argued that it is not inherent that a wireless session

would use a protocol. Although it is still the examiner's position that a wireless

communication session inherently uses some sort of protocol (if there was no protocol

the session could not be established because the devices would not know how to

communicate with each other), Parsons explicitly discloses this as a communication

session between client and server using a remote protocol (col. 6 ln. 2-7).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Zhang by incorporating the public/private data distinction as taught by Masumoto for the purpose of giving a more effective presentation. The motivation for doing so is provided by Masumoto as allowing the presenter to refer to notes without allowing the audience to see the notes. Also, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use remote sessions for the purpose of connecting to a device over a network. Creating remote sessions between network devices by using a remote protocol is well known in the art and yields predictable results, as evidenced by Parsons, Jr.

Zhang, Masumoto and Parsons do not explicitly disclose "a wireless "available for discovery" signal ... is transmitted by the at least one client display device only when the client display device is placed in an "allow others to project" state" however this is disclosed by Salonidis as using Bluetooth which lets devices render themselves "available for discovery" (abstract, paragraph 2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Zhang, Masumoto and Parsons to use Bluetooth for the purpose of communication. Bluetooth is well known in the art and yields predictable results. Thus the combination is merely the combination of known elements according to their established function in order to yield a predictable results.

Regarding claim 34, Zhang discloses "an authoring tool" as the server is connected to the projector and thus must contain the presentation software (pg. 460 section 3.1).

Regarding claim 35, Zhang discloses "a publishing tool" as the server must "publish" the material to the projector / other computing devices (pg. 460 section 3.1, pg. 462 section 4.3 Fig. 4).

Regarding claim 36, Zhang does not disclose "said publishing is said public content and wherein at least one alteration to said public content after publishing with the publishing tool is said private content" however this is taught by Masumoto as converting data from public content to private content (col. 15 ln. 63-67).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Zhang by incorporating the public/private data distinction as taught by Masumoto for the purpose of giving a more effective presentation. The motivation for doing so is provided by Masumoto as allowing the presenter to refer to notes without allowing the audience to see the notes.

Regarding claim 37, Zhang does not disclose "at least one portion of the content is designated as private content via said user interface" however this is taught by Masumoto as designated portions as private content (col. 17 ln. 36-37).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Zhang by incorporating the public/private data distinction as taught by Masumoto for the purpose of giving a more effective presentation. The motivation for doing so is provided by Masumoto as allowing the presenter to refer to notes without allowing the audience to see the notes.

Regarding claim 38, Zhang does not disclose "at least one alteration of said public content made via said authoring tool is designated as private content" however this is taught by Masumoto as designating private content, such content can be an alteration of said public content (col. 16 ln. 33-38).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Zhang by incorporating the public/private data distinction as taught by Masumoto for the purpose of giving a more effective presentation. The motivation for doing so is provided by Masumoto as allowing the presenter to refer to notes without allowing the audience to see the notes.

Regarding claim 39, Zhang does not disclose "at least one alteration includes at least one of a masking, a deletion, an annotating and a highlighting" however this is taught by Masumoto as highlighting content to mark it as private (col. 15 ln. 65-67),

deleting content (col. 15 ln. 67 – col. 16 ln. 2), and marking content as private (col. 16 ln. 36-37).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Zhang by incorporating the public/private data distinction as taught by Masumoto for the purpose of giving a more effective presentation. The motivation for doing so is provided by Masumoto as allowing the presenter to refer to notes without allowing the audience to see the notes.

Regarding claim 40, Zhang discloses "the rendering of the public content on said at least one client display device is controlled via said user interface" as controlling a display through a user interface (pg. 463 section 4.4)

Regarding claim 41, Zhang does not specifically disclose "control of a rate of display" however Masumoto teaches using slides for a presentation (col. 1 ln. 49-50) and a slide presentation inherently has a rate control.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the presentation system of Zhang to use slide presentation applications. Such applications are well known and yield predictable results.

Regarding claim 42, Zhang does not specifically disclose "said content is a slide presentation however this is taught by Masumoto as using slides for a presentation (col. 1 ln. 49-50).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the presentation system of Zhang to use slide presentation applications. Such applications are well known and yield predictable results.

Regarding claim 43, neither Zhang nor Masumoto expressly disclose "transmits only said public content of the selected content to the at least one client display device" however the method and system taught by Masumoto achieves the result of only showing the public content. Masumoto teaches "hiding" the private content rather than not transferring it however the result is the same either way. Thus the motivation for transmitting only public content is to hide private content which is exactly what Masumoto discloses. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to simply not transfer the private data for the purpose of keeping it private, especially given the motivation and teaching of Masumoto.

Regarding claim 44, it substantially corresponds to claim 33 and those corresponding parts are rejected for similar reasons. Zhang also discloses "means for displaying" as laptop with a display screen (pg. 459 section 1).

Regarding claims 45-48, they correspond to claims 36-37, 40 and 43 respectively, thus they are rejected for the same reasons given above.

Regarding claim 49, it is a medium claim that corresponds to the device of claim 33, thus it is rejected for similar reasons.

Regarding claim 50, it is a medium claim that corresponds to the device of claim 36, thus it is rejected for similar reasons.

Regarding claim 51, it is a medium claim that corresponds to the device of claim 35, thus it is rejected for similar reasons.

Regarding claim 52, it is a medium claim that corresponds to the device of claim 39, thus it is rejected for similar reasons.

Regarding claims 53-55, they are medium claims that correspond to the device of claims 37 and 40-41 respectively, thus they are rejected for similar reasons.

Regarding claim 56, Zhang does not explicitly disclose "said means for controlling substantially synchronizes the rendering" however this is taught by Masumoto as selecting what content to show (col. 5 ln. 15-19).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to combine Zhang with the teachings of Masumoto for the purpose of

improving a presentation. Masumoto suggests that by having private and public content

a presentation can be improved (col. 3 ln. 15-55).

Conclusion

2.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure.

Raju US 2003/0110217 A1 discloses a networked projection system.

Olkkonen et al. US 2005/0088980 A1 discloses discovering devices and services

in an ad hoc network.

Reilly US 2004/0192349 A1 discloses wirelessly transmitting discovery signals.

Kindberg et al. US 2004/0003250 A1 discloses using network discovery protocols

to discover resources/devices wirelessly.

3.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in

this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37

CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not
mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the
shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any
extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of
the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later
than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the
examiner should be directed to JASON RECEK whose telephone number is (571)270-
1975. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Thurs 8:30am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's
supervisor, Andrew Caldwell can be reached on (571) 272-3868. The fax phone
number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-
273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Andrew Caldwell/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art
Unit 2442

/Jason Recek/
Examiner, Art Unit 2442
(571) 270-1975